

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Status

Claims 1-18 are pending. The Applicant has amended claims 1-4. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for having insufficient support in the specification for the means-plus-function language in the claim. The Applicant has amended claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 to eliminate the means-plus-function language. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite a processor and non-transitory memory to preclude any problems under 35 U.S.C. § 101 resulting from the amendments. A person of ordinary skill would readily understand that an Ethernet DSLAM, as described in the Applicant's specification, would include a processor and non-transitory memory. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens, et al. (US 2003/0039244) in view of Sundaresan, et al. (US 2002/0101881). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant's claimed invention is an Ethernet DSLAM configured to provide an **advanced service binding** for a requested service utilizing a plurality of attributes received from an authentication server. The attributes identify an access network for the requested service and a PVC on a local DSL loop associated with the end-user device. **This configuration eliminates the need for a Broadband Remote Access Server (BRAS), which conventionally provides the advanced service binding.** The DSLAM also includes means for training a bridging network terminal to utilize the identified PVC to send upstream traffic from the end-user terminal to the DSLAM and to send initial downstream traffic from the DSLAM to the end-user terminal.

In the Applicant's previous response, it was argued that Owens discloses a conventional DSLAM and utilizes a conventional BRAS to configure the advanced service binding. In his Response to Arguments on page 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Owens shows configuring an Ethernet DSLAM to provide an advanced service binding in paragraphs 0043-0046. However, paragraphs 0043-0046 say absolutely nothing about an Ethernet DSLAM providing the advanced service binding. Although a DSLAM is mentioned in paragraphs 0043 and 0044, Owens goes on to say in paragraphs 0044-0045 that the DSLAM connects to an ATM network and the ATM network, in turn, connects to a BRAS. Thus, Owens does not teach or suggest an Ethernet DSLAM that eliminates the BRAS, as claimed by the Applicant.

The Examiner further contends on page 5 of the Office Action that the same feature of an Ethernet DSLAM configured to provide an advanced service binding and thereby eliminate the BRAS is shown by Sundaresan in paragraphs 0014, 0018, 0020, 0023, 0149, and 0150). These paragraphs, however, do not relate to this feature. In fact, it seems as though the Examiner is citing paragraphs from another, totally unrelated document.

Thus, the combination of Owens, which simply shows the state of the art as described in the Applicant's Background section, and Sundaresan, which seems to be totally unrelated to the claimed invention, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of claims 1, 4, 10 and 13 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens, et al. (US 2003/0039244) in view of Sundaresan, et al. (US 2002/0101881) in view of Holmgren (US 7,277,442). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner relies on the combination of Owens and Sundaresan for showing the limitations of base claims 1 and 10 from which claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 depend. However, as noted above, Owens and Sundaresan fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of the base claims. Holmgren is cited for showing limitations recited in the dependent claims, but also fails to disclose or suggest an Ethernet DSLAM configured

to provide an *advanced service binding* for a requested service utilizing a plurality of attributes received from an authentication server. Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 depend from base claims 1 or 10 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 5 and 14 also recite an Ethernet DSLAM configured to provide an *advanced service binding* for a requested service utilizing a plurality of attributes received from an authentication server. These limitations are not taught or suggested by the combination of Owens, Sundaresan, and Holmgren. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of independent claims 5 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 and 15-18 depend from base claims 5 and 14, respectively, and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of their base claims. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6-9 and 15-18 is respectfully requested.

3.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-18.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven W. Smith, Reg. No. 36,684/

Date: September 7, 2011

Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com